

Ser. No. 10/033,643

REMARKS

Applicant graciously appreciates the Office's attention to the instant application. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is
5 believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the December 17, 2004 Office Action.

Rejections under §102(e)

The Office rejected claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19 and 20 as being anticipated
10 by Stefik et al., USPN 6,233,684 ("Stefik reference"). Applicant currently amends independent claims 1, 13, 17 and 20 to more particularly set forth a scanner or scanning.

Applicant currently amends claim 1 to recite a coding device that comprises a scanner, a printer and a processor with instructions executable by
15 the processor. With respect to claims 13, 17 and 20, Applicant has simply rewritten or represented dependent claims 14, 18 and 21 in independent form and cancelled claims 14, 18 and 21. Claim 13 is now directed to a coding device that comprises a scanner, a network interface and a printer. Claim 17 is now directed to a method that comprises scanning to a printer and printing
20 using the printer. Claim 20 is now directed to scanning to a printer and printing using the printer. Applicant submits that the Stefik reference does not disclose the subject matter of independent claims 1, 13, 17 and 20.

Rejections under §103(a)

The Office rejected claims 2, 14, 18 and 21 as being obvious over the
25 Stefik reference in view of T. Boone Pickens III USPN 6,758,391 ("Pickens III reference"). Claim 2 is currently amended, as is independent claim 1 on which it depends. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 2, as currently amended, are patentable over the Stefik and Pickens III references. As for claims 14, 18 and
30 21, these are represented as independent claims 13, 17 and 20. For the following reasons, Applicant disagrees with the grounds of rejection provided by

Ser. No. 10/033,643

the Office and submits that claims 13, 17 and 20 are patentable over the Stefik and Pickens III references.

The Office notes that "Stefik et al. do not specifically recite input comprising a scanner" as set forth in claims 13, 17 and 20. Applicant agrees.

- 5 The Stefik reference discloses reading embedded data contained in a watermark where a printed document is scanned and a digital representation obtained. Then, according to the Stefik reference, the location of the watermark is found and the embedded data is extracted from the watermark and decoded and subsequently converted to a human readable form (col. 13, lines 45-67).
- 10 Thus, the Stefik reference does not teach or suggest a coding device that can scan and print (claim 13) or a method of printing that includes scanning (claims 17 and 20).

- In forming the obviousness rejection, the Office relies on the Pickens III reference and states: "users of the Pickens III system can scan document
- 15 and/or image information and use said information to query a database (figure 3B)". The Office concludes: "Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Stefik et al. and Pickens III as a means for an author or publisher to advertise content." OA 12/17/05 at page 4. Applicant submits that this evidence and conclusion do not support a prima facie case of obviousness
- 20 as required by §103.

Claim 13 recites a coding device comprising:

- a scanner for inputting text and/or image information;*
- a network interface for receiving code information pertaining to*
- authorship and/or ownership of the text and/or image information; and*
- 25 *a printer for printing code information and the text and/or image information onto a medium.*

The Stefik and Pickens III references do not teach or suggest a coding device that comprises a scanner, a network interface and a printer. Claims 15 and 16 depend on claim 13 and are believed patentable for at least this reason.

- 30 Claim 17 recites a method of printing text and/or image information comprising:

Ser. No. 10/033,643

scanning text and/or image information to a printer;
receiving code information pertaining to authorship and/or ownership of
the text and/or image information using the printer; and
printing text and/or image information based on the code information
5 *using the printer.*

The Stefik and Pickens III references do not teach or suggest such a method of printing using such a printer. Claim 19 depends on claim 17 and is believed patentable for at least this reason.

Claim 20 recites a method of printing text and/or image information
10 comprising:

scanning text and/or image information to a printer;
receiving code information pertaining to authorship and/or ownership of
the text and/or image information using the printer; and
printing code information and text and/or image information using the
15 *printer.*

The Stefik and Pickens III references do not teach or suggest such a method of printing using such a printer.

Conclusion

20 Claims 1-13, 15-17, 19 and 20 are pending and believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

25

30


Ser. No. 10/033,643

5

Respectfully Submitted,
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201

10

Dated: 3/17/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "BP", is written over a horizontal line.

Name: Brian J. Pangre

Reg. No. 42,973

Phone No. (509) 324-9256 ext. 231